

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
April 26, 2011

The regular meeting of the Florence Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Chairman Fratinardo called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Vice Chairman Zekas then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided to the official newspapers and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

Keith Crowell	B. Michael Zekas
John Fratinardo	Robert Adams
John Groze	William Bott
Candida Taylor	

ABSENT: Brett Buddenbaum (excused)
 Ray Montgomery (excused)

ALSO PRESENT: Solicitor David Frank
 Engineer Dan Guzzi
 Planner Robert Perry

Chairman Fratinardo stated that he would go out of order on the agenda and move ahead to Application ZB#2011-02 for Stacey Micallef and Glen Zielinsky. Ms. Micallef and Mr. Zielinsky were both sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Zielinsky stated that they had missed sending the public notice to the utilities and requested that the Board continue the application to the May 24, 2011 meeting and agreed to extend the time limit for Board action.

Motion of Zekas, seconded by Crowell to continue the application to May 24, 2011 as requested.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Crowell, Fratinardo, Groze, Taylor, Zekas, Adams
NOES: None
ABSENT: Buddenbaum, Montgomery

Chairman Fratinardo announced to the public that the application had been continued to the date certain of May 24, 2011 and there would not be any addition public notice provided.

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Fratinardo called for Application ZB#2011-01 for LB Solar, LLC. Applicant is requesting Use Variance and Minor Site Plan approval to permit installation of ground mounted solar panels for the electrical needs of the existing liquor store at 1051-59 Florence-Columbus Road, Florence Township. Block 165.01, Lot 4.02.

Member Groze recused himself due to a conflict and left the dais.

Tom Coleman, from the firm of Raymond Coleman and Heinhold, stated that he was appearing on behalf of LB Solar. He stated that LB Solar is a company that has been formed solely for the purpose of designing, developing and constructing solar facilities that service residential or commercial properties. This application is for a commercial property located at 1051-1059 Florence Columbus Road. The property is 17.43 acres. The lot is 649' deep and is split zoned. The first 300' is located in the OP Office Park zone. The remaining footage to the rear of the property which abuts a residential property is zoned R Residential.

This application is for site plan approval, a Use variance for the expansion of a non-conforming use and a bulk variance. Attorney Coleman stated that he has 4 witnesses to testify tonight, Jim Miller, Bob Stout and two of the applicant representatives and asked that Solicitor Frank swear them in.

Solicitor Frank noted for the record that in attendance for the applicant were James Miller, professional planner and Robert Stout, professional engineer, both who regularly appear before this Board and who have been previously accepted as experts in their respective fields. Mark Dimon stated that he was the applicant and Tom Wilson stated that he was in the solar business. All four men were sworn in by Solicitor Frank.

Attorney Coleman submitted Exhibit A1. Mr. Stout stated that this is a colored rendering of Sheet 3 of the plan that was submitted as part of the application. Mr. Stout stated that he had been retained to provide a site plan for the solar field proposed to service the Liquor Barn. Using Exhibit A1, Mr. Stout pointed out where the solar arrays are proposed on the west of the site. The plan shows 6 arrays of panels facing due north. The front one has a 60 panel array. The back has 66 panels and the center panels are 96 panels for a total of 510 panels. This is the required number to service the energy requirement of the Liquor Barn.

Mr. Stout stated that the plan shows the grading of the site. There will be a small berm running along the left side of the property line, which keeps all the water on the site. In the center of the solar panel field is the inverter. The inverter is a large storage cabinet that takes the DC power from the solar panels and converts to AC and then this gets trenched over to the area before the meter to the Liquor Barn. Mr. Stout stated that there is less than an acre disturbance, including the trench.

Mr. Stout stated that they have also provided a landscape buffer along the westerly property line. There is over 300' clear of the solar panel to the rear property line of any

of the residential properties. Everything will be graded and restored to its natural state. They are using a grass mix that will be maintained and mowed, probably 2 to 3 times a summer. The grass will grow to a maximum of 2' in order to keep it below the solar panels. The solar panels have a tilt to them. They are about 14' wide. The bottom is about a foot and a half to two feet off the ground. The back section at its highest point is 10' off the ground and is tilted at about a 40 degree angle.

Attorney Coleman asked if buffering along Florence Columbus Road was warranted? Mr. Stout said that they did not feel that buffering was warranted and none was proposed. Attorney Coleman asked about the safety features for the inverter cabinet. Mr. Stout said that these cabinets are similar in nature to an electric underground transformer that has an electric panel box sitting on a concrete pad. This basically is the same setup except this is solid with louvers for air ventilation and it is locked. All of the power lines come in through the bottom and go back out through the bottom. Everything is underground and unattainable.

Attorney Coleman asked if the Liquor Barn building itself would act as a buffer to the east of the site. Mr. Stout stated that there is buffering proposed to the west side and the north. The building acts as buffer to the east.

Engineer Guzzi stated that the Board should address the issue of completeness before they go too far into the application. He referred the Board to his April 20, 2011 review letter. He stated that there are really two portions of this application. Items A and B on page 2 regarding the Use Variance portion have been satisfied and is complete. Items C through U are the completeness items for the site plan application. Engineer Guzzi stated that because the amount of disturbance proposed this application is a major site plan, not a minor site plan as was applied for. He stated that there are a number of waivers that are required and he would support the majority of the waivers. However the application should be amended from a minor to a major and a major site plan checklist is required and is not a waivable item.

Attorney Coleman asked if the major classification was per Florence Township Zoning Ordinance. Engineer Guzzi answered that it was per Florence Township Zoning Ordinance because of the amount of disturbance. The amount of disturbance listed on the plans is 43,163 sq. ft., which substantially kicks this into a major site plan. Engineer Guzzi stated that for that reason he reviewed this as a major site plan.

Attorney Coleman stated that he would like to get as much done as possible this evening. Engineer Guzzi stated that he would run through the submission items.

Item C is for the checklist. This is non-waivable and was not submitted for major site plan.

Item D is for the Environmental Impact Statement and based on the scope of this work he supports the waiver.

Items E and F are for the Preliminary Delineation of Wetlands and Stream Encroachment. The plans do indicate that there are no wetlands or streams impacted so he would support the waiver.

Item G is for the location of all existing utilities. This is a large site and there is no change to the utilities so he would support this waiver.

Item H is for existing and proposed storm sewer systems within, or adjacent to, the development. There is no additional storm sewer proposed or required so the waiver is supported.

Item I is for the drainage map and calculations. Engineer Guzzi asked that the applicant address any impact from stormwater runoff onto the neighboring properties and testimony has already been given on this. Mr. Stout said that the site runs from front to back. There is a small berm that has been constructed along the property line as shown on the plans. Mr. Stout said that they have continued that flow which allows any potential stormwater runoff towards the residential. The residential development has been graded back toward this site into a swale that was constructed as part of the residential site plan. The water will follow its natural path that it goes today. It will not impact any of the houses.

Item J is for cross section of watercourses and Item K for boundaries of floodplains of water bodies. Waivers would be supported.

Item L is for soil borings to the water table or 10'. Based on the fact that there is no stormwater management he would support the waiver.

Item M is the location, elevation, type and size of all existing and proposed sidewalks. There are no existing sidewalks, however this is a major site plan which means that sidewalks are required along the frontage of the property or a contribution be made to the municipal sidewalk fund.

Item N is for the existing and proposed signage. There doesn't seem to be any proposed signage so a waiver would be supported.

Item O is for existing and proposed structures and uses. He stated that he believes that all of the existing structures and the proposed structures are shown on the plans and he requested verification for the other uses on the site.

Item P is for existing wells and septic systems. This proposal doesn't impact any of those so as long as there is no well or septic system under the solar panels he would support a waiver.

Item Q is for freestanding signs. Since none are proposed a waiver would be supported.

Item R is for the location of the recycling centers. The Board will recall that the municipality has a newer recycling ordinance that is required to conform to County requirements. Engineer Guzzi asked for testimony on the current recycling procedures for all the existing uses on the site. Mr. Stout stated that this proposal will not generate any additional trash and as far as the recycling requirements, the rear of the property has an enclosed fenced area in which trash and recycling are stored and privately picked up. Attorney Coleman stated that they would make sure that this complies with the County's standards.

Item S is for architect's sealed elevations of proposed structure. A waiver would be supported.

Item T is for the Municipal Services and Utilities Impact Statement. A waiver would be supported

Item U for Sewer and Water Agreement. A waiver is supported for this.

Engineer Guzzi stated that testimony has been given on the few items that it was required for. The big items are the amended application and the completed checklist with respect to the site plan.

Attorney Coleman stated that on behalf of LB Solar he would like to amend the application formerly to a major site plan application. Engineer Guzzi stated that Items C through U address all the items on the Major Site Plan Checklist. Chairman Fratinardo stated that the Major Site Plan Checklist still has to be submitted.

Member Crowell asked for discussion on the existing uses. Engineer Guzzi stated that there have been several approvals on this site for various uses and this gets more into site plan comments as to what the uses are and where on the site they are located.

Vice Chairman Zekas stated that he would like to go back to Item M and hear the applicants plan for sidewalks. Attorney Coleman asked Engineer Guzzi if his office would prepare the construction calculations for the sidewalk. Engineer Guzzi stated that if that route were taken his office would prepare the estimate.

Mr. Dimon stated that there is a possible future development by Burlington County, which may cause the entrance to the site to be moved westerly to the edge of the solar arrays. He stated that the County could require that at any time. Knowing that it would be a waste to put sidewalks in so he would prefer to do the payment in lieu. Engineer Guzzi stated that this was at the Board's discretion. If there is a compelling reason to not install sidewalks then the Board can allow the applicant to make the contribution.

Member Crowell asked if there were any existing sidewalks to the east and west of the property. Mr. Dimon stated that there were not. Member Crowell asked Mr. Dimon to elaborate on the future County development. Mr. Dimon said that there is the possibility that Florence Columbus Road would be widened to a four-lane road. If the County were

to widen the road the existing entrance to the Liquor Barn would have to be relocated to the westerly side of the site. Attorney Coleman stated that he doesn't think that at this time they can affirmatively represent that there is any kind of County plan.

Member Bott stated that as a correction there are sidewalks on the same side as the Liquor Barn but down closer to Route 130 leading into the Manors at Crossroads development.

Member Taylor stated that she had a question about the reflective nature of the panels. She stated that the panels will face sunrise during the winter months and she is concerned about the glare from the panels affecting motorists on Florence Columbus Road.

Vice Chairman Zekas stated that the Board needed to address the issue of completeness including the Major Site Plan Checklist. Solicitor Frank stated that the Board has gone over the missing submission items for the Major Site Plan Checklist so it has been done on the record but there is no paper to back it up. Chairman Fratinardo stated that it could be a condition of the approval.

Attorney Coleman stated that it might help the Board if Mr. Dimon discussed the current uses on the property. Mr. Dimon stated that he was not an owner or an operator of the businesses out there. He said there is the Liquor Barn, Wayside Florist and Landscaping and the Seasonal Potbelly's barbecue. Mr. Dimon stated that to the best of his knowledge these uses would remain. He said that to the best of his knowledge the Estate of John Dimon that owns the site and of which Mr. Dimon is the executor does not have plans for any additional uses on the site.

Vice Chairman Zekas moved to grant the applicants request to amend the application for a major site plan with a condition that the Major Site Plan Checklist be provided as soon as possible and based on testimony that the applicant will make a contribution to the sidewalk fund, grant the waivers and deem complete. The motion was seconded by Member Adams.

On the Question:

Member Taylor stated that she was concerned about the environmental impact waiver. She said that she wanted to hear what the applicant is proposing for the safety of the roadway in terms of the reflection from the panels.

Mr. Stout said that the environmental impact is really for what it is going to do for the future. There are two things that are definitely going to eliminate any potential for sun glare. First the panels are on a 45 degree angle so any sunlight that would hit it, if they were reflective, would reflect up. Secondly, the whole point of a solar panel is to absorb the sun, not to reflect it. So by nature, they absorb the sun.

Member Taylor stated that she understands what they are supposed to do, but she has seen solar panels cause glare. Mr. Stout said that even if they were reflective, traveling

down Florence Columbus Road towards the turnpike, you would only see the sides of the panel, plus there is an evergreen buffer on the side. If you are coming over the turnpike overpass heading towards the Liquor Barn, the panels are off to the right hand side and almost at a 60 degree angle. You would have to turn into the Liquor Barn and turn right towards the panels to get any type of reflection.

Member Taylor asked again if you were traveling over the turnpike overpass on a winter's morning, there would be no sun glare from the panels. Mr. Stout stated that he has done 10 solar panel fields and the testimony has consistently been that there is very little reflection from the solar panels. Member Taylor said that she just wants to be sure that they have done extensive testing, especially on this site, because she drives that area all the time. She stated that she knows where the sun comes from in the winter because she drives that way to go to work. She said that she just wants to be sure that it will be safe for the people who use that road to go to work. Mr. Stout said that the location of these panels is far enough back that you would have to actually turn and look directly at it to see the field. You will see the structure but no sun glare from the panels will impact the drivers.

Chairman Fratinardo called for a roll call vote on the motion.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Crowell, Fratinardo, Taylor, Zekas, Adams, Bott
 NOES: None
 ABSENT: Buddenbaum, Montgomery

Attorney Coleman called James Miller and said that Solicitor Frank and the Board have been kind enough to recognize him as an expert here. He asked Mr. Miller to tell the Board what his involvement with this application was. Mr. Miller stated for the record that he was a licensed professional planner in the state of New Jersey and also certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners as a certified planner. He stated that as part of his preparation for this evening's hearing he met with the applicant on site, walked the site, and evaluated the potential impact of the panels on both the site and the surrounding area. He stated that he has also been involved with other applications involving solar panel arrays and has gone to numerous locations where solar panel arrays exist and has been able to observe their potential impacts and their character.

Mr. Miller submitted Exhibit A2, which is a photograph of a panel array similar to the one proposed this evening. The photographs in question were taken in Woolwich Township on Kings Highway. There is a business there called Hillshire Farms and it is similar to this application as the solar panels provide the power to operate that business. He stated that he chose this because it is a 4-panel array. The photographs show both the front and rear view of the panels. These panels have a smooth surface but there is no real glare. This photo was taken on a sunny day at noon.

Mr. Miller stated that this is an application that involves the expansion of pre-existing non-conforming use because this is a professional zone and there are a couple of retail uses on site. It is also an application, which involves and inherently beneficial use and a C variance.

Mr. Miller stated that he would begin with the D variances. The solar panels are also by statute an inherently beneficial use. This means that it is a use that inherently serves the public good and by its very nature promotes that public good. Because it is an inherently beneficial use it is assumed to satisfy the positive criteria.

By virtue of it being an inherently beneficial use you do not have to establish special reasons. What the courts have done in the alternative is a balancing test that is commonly called the Sica Test. There are 4 steps to this process. First to establish the benefit of the use, second to identify any potential detriment that might occur as a result of the use, third to investigate ways that the impact could potentially be mitigated and finally to apply any mitigation measures to balance the benefit of the use against the potential detriment. If the benefit is greater then the detriment then the use satisfies the criteria. Mr. Miller stated that he also has to address whether this impairs the intent or purpose of the zone plan.

Mr. Miller testified that this is public benefit, which is a collective benefit in that the more we can substituted renewable sources for energy sources based on fossil fuels or nuclear energy, the more we realize the economic and environmental benefits of making that substitution.

This is also a use that advances a number of purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. Specifically Purpose N, which addresses sustainable energy “to promote utilization of renewable energy resources.” This use also satisfies Purpose A, which is to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use and development of all lands in the state in a manner that will promote the public health, safety, morals and general welfare. Because of some of the environmental benefits of this use there is a specific health benefit as well. The advantages of sustainable energy include reduction of pollution, particulates, carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide that can be generated through power generation. There is no radiation, no resource extraction and no soot generated.

Member Bott asked if these panels had to be cleaned at any time. Mr. Miller stated that they did not.

Mr. Miller said that there is an advantage in that this use reduces our dependence on foreign oil. It advances the purposes of New Jersey’s Energy Master Plan, which calls for the state to have 30% of its electric power generated by renewable resources by the year 2020. It advances the goal of a lot of the legislation including Assembly Bill 3520, which encourages the use of sustainable power and Class 1 renewable energy resources. It also works to reduce the state’s reliance on power that comes from out of state. New Jersey is a state that has no indigenous source of energy other than the wind and the sun.

Mr. Miller continued that finally there is a specific benefit in this use in that there will be 14,200 kw of energy produced by this facility which is roughly 86% of the demand for the other uses on the property. So when this installation is completed it will supply about 86% of the power that is required by the other uses on the property.

Solicitor Frank said that it was his understanding that this was specifically designed to satisfy the energy needs of the Liquor Barn and is therefore accessory to that particular use. He asked if Mr. Miller was saying that the solar panels would supply energy to all of the uses on the site? Mr. Miller stated that he had misspoken and it will only supply the energy needs of the Liquor Barn.

Mr. Miller said that the second step of the process is to identify the potential impacts and overall this is a benign, passive use. This is a very safe use. There is no moving equipment, no personnel on site. It doesn't produce glare, runoff, vibrations or potable water demand. It doesn't represent any permanent commitment of any natural resource. There is no discernible noise.

Mr. Miller said that the primary potential impact is really its visual impact and that is why he brought the photographs, so the Board and the public could see exactly what this is going to look like and by extension what the potential impact would be on the surrounding community.

Mr. Miller said that the third step of the process is the mitigation of the potential impact. He said that he believes that the visual impact of these is relatively minor. It is minor because they are not very high and they are dark in tone and color so they tend to blend in, especially if you are looking at it from the rear. There is a series of way to mitigate visual impact, including screening, color, distance, the context of the facility and even habituation (the longer it is there, the more people get used to it).

Mr. Miller said that in this particular instance they have been able to screen the views from the west by planting some screening materials along the side of the area where the panels are going to be arrayed. The panels are a neutral color and if you are viewing it from behind you are basically looking at the shadow of the panel. In this case there is a very substantial setback from the panels to the nearest residential use (approximately 300') so distance becomes a means of mitigating the impact. In terms of context these panels are going in a non-residential zoning district and basically any comparisons you make with the permitted uses are with basically active non-residential uses, which would be permitted on this location.

Chairman Fratinardo asked if there was a buffer planned for the north side of the panels that faces the residences. Mr. Miller said that was correct. Member Bott asked if there would be any fencing for security reasons. Mr. Miller said there may be a fence around the inverter, but fencing is not necessary as these are not dangerous items. Member Bott was concerned with vandalism to the panels.

Mr. Miller said that basically there are a lot of factors in place that would mitigate the relatively minor visual impact of these panels. When you compare the benefits of this inherently beneficial use, which are all the environmental benefits, economic benefits and sustainable energy and compare those to the relatively minor impact that this use has because again it is a very benign and passive use. He stated that it is his view that the benefit of this use is much greater than its detriment. And as a result the use satisfies the Sica balancing test.

Mr. Miller stated that in terms of the impairment of the intent and purpose of the zone plan, Florence permits utility uses in all of its zoning districts. Therefore this is a use that is akin to what would normally be a permitted use. It is not permitted primarily because it is not a public utility. Although this is not really a utility it has all the attributes of a utility. This use is primarily in a non-residential zone, although there is a portion that extends into the residential zone. This use is much less intensive than the other uses permitted in this district (office use or parking lot).

Mr. Miller stated that he would like to address the items that were mentioned in Planner Perry's letter dated April 19, 201, Section III on page 4, items 2a through 2e.

Item 2a this use will not injure or detract from the use of neighboring properties. The solar panels will not generate noise or activity that would encroach on any of the adjoining uses.

Item 2b this use will not detract from the character of the neighborhood, as it is 300' from the nearest home. The panels are mostly in the non-residential portion of the site. Only a few panels that extend over the residential property line and it would be a permitted accessory use if the property were primarily an agricultural property.

Item 2c the properties next to this will be safeguarded because there is nothing hazardous occurring on the site. The inverter box is secure and there is nothing else there that could be considered hazardous.

Item 2d the lot is fully suited for the expansion of this pre-existing non-conforming use. It has adequate space for the arrays.

Item 2e this expanded use serves the best interest of the township by providing an environmental and economic benefit that comes with using solar panels as a means of generating energy and also because it is appropriate for this district and the benefits outweigh any potential detriment from the use. There is very little potential for this use to create any conflict with the balance of the zoning district because it is a passive use in a non-residential district. In addition there are mitigation measures that can be taken to lessen the impact of this use, including landscaping, setbacks, color, etc.

Mr. Miller stated that for all these reasons he believes that this use satisfies both the positive and negative criteria, that there is no impairment of the intent or purpose of the

zone plan as a result of this use. From a use standpoint this is a justified expansion of the pre-existing non-conforming use.

Member Crowell said that Mr. Miller alluded to screening. The plan shows screening on one side, but the rear portion of the property there is a 300' buffer between the residential and the subject area but screening is not being recommended there. However, Planner Perry is recommending screening in that area. Mr. Miller said that he does believe that there would be some benefit from additional screening. He stated that he is not sure exactly where it should be located. There is some screening that was installed when the residential development was constructed. It is somewhat sparse and it would primarily benefit the two units, which are directly behind the panels.

Member Crowell asked if residents could see the solar arrays from their property? Mr. Miller stated that yes they could. Member Crowell asked how this would be mitigated? Mr. Miller stated that you would mitigate this by putting some landscaping to create some screening. He stated that the best place to put the landscaping would be right on the property line. Member Taylor asked if it was the applicant's intention to add screening or is Mr. Miller just agreeing that this is a good idea? Attorney Coleman asked Mr. Dimon if additional screening were required would he consider adding the landscaping. Mr. Dimon stated that he would add landscaping if the Board required it.

Planner Perry stated that there is a planted berm behind the houses. If you have a berm that is landscaped and then propose something in front of the berm you won't get much benefit from it. One possibility would be to enhance the existing berm. A second possibility would be to add landscaping on an angle closer to the panels but far enough away as to not block the sun. Attorney Coleman suggested that Mr. Miller and Mr. Stout devise a screening plan and submit it to Planner Perry for his approval.

Vice Chairman Zekas said that one of the comments made was a way minimize negative impact and Mr. Miller mentioned the size of the lot. Vice Chairman Zekas said the Board knows where the placement of the panels is proposed which right now requires a setback variance. He asked if any testimony could be offered to indicate that this is the optimal location for the solar panels.

Mr. Miller said that this speaks to the proofs for the C variances. He said that with the C variances the applicant has to show that it will advance the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL). He said that this variance would advance 2 purposes of the MLUL, Purpose A, which he sited earlier and Purpose C which is to provide adequate light, air, and open space. The reason that this becomes a better zoning alternative is because ultimately you want to create as much separation between this use and the residential uses. By moving the panels forward you maximize the setback between the commercial and residential uses. Secondly, you want the panels to be in the non-residential zone if at all possible because it is more of a non-residential use than a residential use. So from a zoning perspective it is more appropriate in a professional district than it would be in a residential district. The primary benefits are that you get some separation from the residential and you also locate it in the non-residential zone.

Also it works very well from a functional standpoint because this is an open area where you have ideal conditions for the sun to get to the panels.

Member Bott said that if he owned one of those adjoining residential properties the proposed buffers would shield his view from his first floor, but he would see the panels from his second story windows.

Mr. Stout said that they were looking at the best way to buffer or screen this. He suggested extending the hedgerow along the north side of the panels; this would give buffering from both first and second floors once the hedgerow grew in within a few years. The buffer would have to be stopped at a certain point so that it doesn't interfere with the sunlight to the panels. Planner Perry stated that they could get the angle of deflection and protract out the sun's movement and go to the furthest distance without affecting the sun on the panels. Mr. Stout said that he would work with Planner Perry on this.

Attorney Coleman submitted Exhibit A3, which was described as an overhead aerial photograph that shows the subject site and some adjoining properties and a photograph that shows the view from the northwest corner of the site. Mr. Miller said that this shows that there is a lot of mature vegetation already on the site acting as a buffer for several of the residences. This also illustrates how distance acts as a buffer because the photo shows cars in the parking lot but they are very difficult to see in this photograph.

Mr. Miller said that to wrap up the testimony on the C variances and from the standpoint of impairment of intent and purpose of the zone plan, basically these variances help to enable the inherently beneficial use which is the solar panels. He stated that in his opinion the setback variance would not impair the intent or purpose of the zone plan as well, mostly because of the fact that it is better to put the panels here than it is to put them anywhere else on the property.

Chairman Fratinardo stated that there was testimony given that the County might be expanding onto the front of the site. He asked if there was enough distance from the County right of way if they put in that roadway to allow installation of a sidewalk? Mr. Stout said this would not affect the solar panel location as it is shown today. He said that if they do widen it they would only widen one lane and the setback would be 66'. Engineer Guzzi stated that there would be 17' from the right of way to the panels. Engineer Guzzi stated that the proposal is for 25' from the existing right of way. The front yard setback variance is based on the setback of the principal use. In order to conform to the ordinance the array would have to be shifted back behind the principal structure and would be right up against the residential.

Vice Chairman Zekas said that the 25' seems a little tight and asked if there was a way to relocate the panels to allow for more setback? Mr. Stout said there is some flexibility and if the Board required they could move the array back a bit, but they still need the area between the panels for shading.

Chairman Fratinardo stated that the site did not look well kept and asked if it could be cleaned up at all? Mr. Dimon stated that the mulch piles were part of the landscaping business. Attorney Coleman said that the applicant would recommend to the owner of the landscaping business that the site is cleaned up. Member Crowell said that landscaping business was there before the residential development was built. The Board has to be cognizant of existing businesses. Obviously people looked at their rear yard before they decided to buy the property.

Vice Chairman Zekas asked what type of cable the power line was between the inverter and the user? Mr. Tom Wilson stated that it was conduit. It was completely encased, waterproof and very safe. The cable is buried 1' to 2' deep. The inverters are located right in the middle of the panels to minimize any power loss.

Motion of Bott, seconded by Crowell to open the hearing to public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Solicitor Frank swore all the residents who wished to offer testimony in simultaneously.

Larry Bragg, 300 Seybe Lane, stated that he was part of the Homeowner's Association for the residential development. Mr. Bragg asked if there would be any reflection from the panels toward the homes. The Board replied that none of the reflection would be pointed toward the houses. They showed Mr. Bragg the photographs that had been submitted to illustrate this.

Solicitor Frank suggested to Mr. Miller that he show the aerial photograph to the public so they can see the location of the buffers.

Suneel Sharad asked what the height of the buffer would be since the second floor of the homes would be facing toward the panels. Mr. Miller responded that the proposed buffering and the distance should be adequate to screen the panels even from the second floor windows.

Solicitor Frank suggested that this application be adjourned briefly to allow the applicant's professionals to have a private discussion with the residents out in the hallway and the Board can move on to another application since there is a very full agenda this evening. Chairman Fratinardo called for a 5 minute recess.

The board returned to the regular order of business.

Attorney Denis Germano appearing for Dr. Blum stated that they have an application for Preliminary and Final Major Site plan approval with bulk variances on the agenda tonight. He stated that he spoke with Solicitor Frank and it appears that they will not be able to get to Dr. Blum's application before 11:00. He requested that Application ZB#2011-04 for Florence Family Dental, P.C. be continued on the record to May 24, 2011. Attorney Germano agreed to an extension of time for Board action.

54.

Motion of Zekas, seconded by Taylor to continue the application without the need to re-notice.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Crowell, Fratinardo, Taylor, Zekas, Adams
NOES: None
ABSENT: Buddenbaum, Montgomery

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION ZB-2011-06A

Revising the resolution of Brian and Susan Petuch to remove the one year expiration date but retaining all other conditions of Resolution ZB-2011-06.

Motion of Zekas, seconded by Adams to approve Resolution ZB-2011-06A.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Fratinardo, Taylor, Crowell, Groze, Zekas
NOES: None
ABSENT: Buddenbaum, Montgomery

Chairman Fratinardo called to reopen the public comment for Application ZB#2011-01 for LB Solar, LLC.

Winston Casalinuevo said that his property is at 208 Leffler directly behind the proposed plans. He stated that he doesn't have a problem as long as the trees are high enough and are properly maintained. He asked if there was any data to the impact that these structures would have on the values of the surrounding properties. Solicitor Frank stated that property value and surrounding property values is not something that this Board addresses. There is no data that this Board would have regarding value. Chairman Fratinardo stated that solar panels have become more acceptable so they wouldn't have as negative an impact on value.

Prashant Raval, 210 Leffler Circle, stated that he is in favor of the evergreen buffer but he asked if there could be a fence or a divider on the berm. Solicitor Frank stated that the berm is not on the applicant's property it is actually part of the Crossroads Development so the Board does not have the authority to make this applicant provide a fence on the berm. Member Crowell stated that Mr. Raval could ask his association to install a fence on the berm.

Suneel Sharad asked if these panels were fixed or if they would be turned. Attorney Coleman stated that they are fixed panels. Mr. Sharad asked that since these panels are facing Florence Columbus Road would there be no impact at all to drivers on Florence

Columbus Road. Solicitor Frank stated that the testimony from the applicant's engineer has been that these panels are light absorbing and do not produce glare.

Mr. Wilson stated that these panels are tilted up in the air towards the sun and will not impact any cars. Mr. Sharad stated that he feels that there will be some sort of reflection due to the angle that these panels are being set at.

Motion of Bott, seconded by Crowell to close the public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Chairman Fratinardo asked the Board's Professional's to go over their review letters. Planner Perry stated that the applicant's planner, Mr. Miller, has addressed all the items that must be addressed for the Board to consider the Use Variance. He has gone over all the proofs that are required under New Jersey Land Use Law. Planner Perry stated that Mr. Miller has adequately satisfied all his comments about the plan especially the buffering. Planner Perry stated that the applicant, through his planner, has satisfactorily addressed his concerns and also met the requirements of New Jersey Land Use Law.

Engineer Guzzi said that his letter dated April 20, 2011 was actually his second review so a lot of the initial comments had already been addressed by the applicant in the plans that were provided as well as the testimony.

Engineer Guzzi referred the Board to Item 7 on page 5 regarding a detail of the solar ray foundation. Mr. Stout indicated that this would be provided.

Item 8 has been satisfied.

Item 9 regarding the requirement for sidewalks for all Major Site Plan applications. The request from the application is that they make a contribution in lieu of providing sidewalks. If the Board is satisfied that there are circumstances that would warrant that contribution in lieu of then his office would calculate that amount that the sidewalk would cost and the applicant would be required to contribute 120% of that amount to the Township Sidewalk Fund.

Item 10 is the variance required for the front yard setback that has been discussed.

Item 11 regarding the parking requirements for the season barbecue. Mr. Stout agreed to add this to the Parking Schedule.

Item 12 the required rear yard setback and side yard setback should be revised on the Bulk Table. Mr. Stout agreed to revise this.

Item 13 the survey indicates that the barbecue parking area is stone and a prior approval required that it be paved. Mr. Stout stated that the lot has been paved and he will update the survey.

Item 14 the required setback lines should be revised to indicate the correct rear and side yard setbacks for the R Zoning District. Mr. Stout agreed to revise this.

Item 15 is the density of the screen plantings – 5’ required, 20’ proposed. Engineer Guzzi stated that Planner Perry would work with Mr. Stout’s office to provide adequate screening so this can be considered satisfied.

Item 16 Mr. Stout verified that the area of disturbance did include the area of the utility trench and required sidewalk.

Member Adams stated that the Environmental Commission had submitted a review letter listing 2 comments. The one regarding the visual barrier along the back of the property has already been addressed through testimony. The second comment involved screening to prevent glare from the panels affecting the drivers on Florence Columbus Road. The testimony provided indicates that the panels will not create any glare but he asked if the Board should report back to the Environmental Commission. Member Bott stated that he was a member of the Environmental Commission and he would report back to the Commission regarding this matter.

Solicitor Frank stated that the application is for a D2 variance for an expansion of the pre-existing non-conforming use of the liquor store to provide for the accessory use of solar and there is a front yard setback variance required. Conditions of approval would be the sidewalk fund contribution, plan updates, which will include submission of the extent and conditions of uses on the site, as they exist presently. The submission of the document of the Major Site Plan Checklist. The addition of more screening at the rear of the site along the northwesterly property line and there will be screening that arc along the northern edge of the panels that goes across easterly toward the existing buffer and the pond. The objective is to screen the panels and the mulch piles from as much of the neighborhood as possible. These trees will be 8’ to 10’ tall at the time of planting and otherwise in accord with the administrative approval of the Board Planner. There are plan details that need to be revised per Engineer Guzzi’s April 2, 2011 letter and the standard conditions.

Motion of Bott, seconded by Taylor to approve the application with the conditions as previously stated by Solicitor Frank.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS:	Crowell, Fratinardo, Taylor, Zekas, Adams, Bott
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	Buddenbaum, Montgomery

Member Groze returned to the dais.

Chairman Fratinardo called for Application ZB#2011-03 for Helen E. Campbell, VMD. Applicant is requesting a Use Variance to convert former lawn/garden equipment and

tractor sale/supplies site into a veterinary hospital on property located at 2126 Old York Road, Florence Township. Block 168, Lot 15.

William Sitzler, Esq. stated that he represents Dr. Helen Campbell, a doctor of veterinary medicine, in this application before the Board on property owned by Marvin and Eileen Wainwright located at 2126 Old York Road. This application is for a D1 variance. He stated that they are asking the Board to consider bifurcating this for a site plan approval. This is being done with the consent of Mr. Wainwright who is here present today. Attorney Sitzler stated that he would like to start with the completeness items.

Engineer Guzzi referred the Board to his review dated April 12, 2011. He stated that all the submission items for the variance application have been submitted and he recommended that the Board deem the application complete.

Attorney Sitzler stated that he would call 3 witnesses tonight: Marvin Wainwright, Dr. Campbell and Barbara Fegley, professional planner. The witnesses were sworn in by Solicitor Frank.

Mr. Wainwright testified that he lives next door to the subject property. He operated a farm equipment sales/supply business from the subject site for approximately 38 years. He stated that he had appeared before the Zoning Board many years ago to get a variance for the John Deere Lawn and Garden Equipment business. Mr. Wainwright said the business was for sales and service of John Deere equipment, Simplicity and Toro. He stated that he sold the business on April 1, 2010 and the business relocated to Rt. 206 three months later.

Mr. Wainwright said that they had several people inquire about renting the site, but he was waiting for a tenant who would be a good fit for the site and the neighborhood. He stated that the building is 12" cement block walls all the way around and is built on a concrete floor. The building is about 20' high at the peak. Engineer Guzzi stated as long as it is less than 35' it is permitted in the zone.

Mr. Wainwright stated that most of the adjoining properties have at least 1 acre lots and directly behind the site is Mr. Schoen's farm which is Farmland Preserved.

Attorney Sitzler submitted exhibit A1, which is an aerial photo of the site dated 2007. Mr. Wainwright pointed out where his home was located next to the site. He stated that his business was the largest John Deere consumer product dealer in the state of New Jersey. Mr. Wainwright stated that he had customers coming into the site all the time. There were never any complaints from the neighborhood regarding traffic.

Attorney Sitzler asked Mr. Wainwright to speak about the level of noise from the building. Mr. Wainwright said that they often had lawnmowers running in the building and never had any complaints from neighbors about noise.

Solicitor Frank asked Mr. Wainwright to describe the interior of the building. Mr. Wainwright stated that the inside was block walls, was wood trussed and was built on a concrete slab.

Member Adams asked if this building was soundproofed? Mr. Wainwright stated that he did not think that the noise from the dogs would be loud enough to cause any complaints. Attorney Sitzler stated that there would be no boarding of animals. The only animals on site will be there for treatment.

Attorney Sitzler called Dr. Helen Campbell who relayed to the Board that she had graduated in 1985 from the University of Pennsylvania. She is licensed in New Jersey and has been practicing for 26 years. She stated that she treats small animals, dogs and cats, no large or farm animals. Dr. Campbell stated that she has worked as an associate and is now attempting to open her own practice. She stated that she has a well-established clientele.

Attorney Sitzler asked Dr. Campbell to describe the nature of her practice. Dr. Campbell answered that this is a one doctor practice. There would be regular office visits by appointment only. There would only be 4 animals in the building at a time for appointments. On surgery day there could be up to 8 surgeries scheduled. The animals would be dropped off in the morning and picked up at night. The hours would be from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Chairman Fratinardo asked about emergencies. Dr. Campbell stated that she would not be doing her own emergencies. She stated that the practice would be strictly by appointment only. Walk in appointments are extremely rare. It would either be an emergency situation or someone who is not a regular client.

Dr. Campbell said that with one doctor there would be a maximum of 4 clients at the facility at the same time. She stated that the staff would consist of one receptionist, two technicians and an intermittent hospital administrator.

Attorney Sitzler submitted Exhibit A2 a floor plan of the proposed veterinary facility. Dr. Campbell stated that there would be a vestibule with two doors to protect against animal escape, reception area, two exam rooms, break room, rest room, surgery room, radiology room, separate cat room, recovery room, and a lab. She stated that there is no intent to board animals at all. Dr. Campbell said that on a surgery day there would be a maximum of 8 animals that would be picked up at the end of the day.

Attorney Sitzler asked Dr. Campbell to give a description of her volunteer work. Dr. Campbell stated that she has done volunteer work spaying and neutering. She has also done pro bono work.

Dr. Campbell indicated that the staff parking would be located at the rear of the building. Deliveries would also be to the rear of the building. Dr. Campbell stated that she also does house calls for large animals that have orthopedic issues as well as senior owners of pets who are unable to get to the clinic. Dr. Campbell stated that she does counseling to pet owners whose pets must be euthanized.

Dr. Campbell said that she wanted to address the issue of noise. She stated that a barking dog is an unhappy dog and she doesn't want that. She stated that there will be soundproofing between the walls. This helps to keep a pleasant environment for the staff and the animals as well as allows for patient confidentiality. She stated that there is a separate cat ward because cats get stressed and need to be isolated from dogs.

Member Taylor asked if Dr. Campbell belonged to a professional organization for veterinarians that help with guidelines and protocols for creating a healthy environment? Is there an overseeing agency to make sure that the guidelines are met? Dr. Campbell said that each sub part requires specifications but the state governing committee inspects the veterinarian. Attorney Sitzler asked Dr. Campbell what kind of inspections her licensing agency does? Dr. Campbell stated that your state and national board govern you. Dr. Campbell stated that there are agencies that she contracts with for disposal of medical waste, etc.

Chairman Fratinardo asked for the number of parking spaces in the front for clients. Dr. Campbell stated that there are 16 spaces in the front and there is also additional parking available in the back of the site if necessary.

Member Crowell asked if there were any chemicals or compressed gases being used. Dr. Campbell stated that they use oxygen and the anesthesia. She stated that all drugs have to fit the state requirement of being stored in double locked boxes. There is a separate secure area inside the building for oxygen storage.

Member Bott asked if Dr. Campbell expects her practice to grow. Dr. Campbell stated that if the practice grew she would hire an associate. Solicitor Frank stated that Dr. Campbell has to understand that if the Board grants a use variance it is very specific. If the success of this site would require a second veterinarian on site it is important for the Board to know this. Dr. Campbell stated that there would be two veterinarians but there would only be one on site at a time.

Member Taylor asked for a description of the equipment that will be on site. Dr. Campbell stated that all of the equipment will be state of the art and would include a radiograph machine; surgery equipment, lab equipment and all will be computerized. She stated that she would be equipped to perform major surgery, but not orthopedic surgery or any surgery that would require intensive care.

Barbara Fegley stated that she was a New Jersey licensed professional planner and also a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. She stated that she has 32 years experience and has represented a number of Boards throughout South Jersey. The Board accepted Ms. Fegley as an expert in the field of professional planning.

Ms. Fegley submitted exhibit A3, which is an aerial view of the site and the surrounding area. She stated that Mr. Wainwright's home is on one side of the property, a residence on the other side of the property, to the northwest there is another residential property and then farmland. The property immediately adjacent to the south and the east of the site is

preserved land open space. She stated that the Florence Township Zoning Ordinance and map identifies the site as AGR Agricultural Zoning. Permitted uses are single family residential dwellings, farms, farm buildings and roadside farm stands. The zone also permits a number of conditional uses including utility structures and facilities, quasi-public buildings and recreation areas, charitable uses, philanthropic use and hospitals. Ms. Fegley stated that the ordinance permits hospitals as a conditional use and she suggested that this veterinary clinic could be termed a hospital for animals

Ms. Fegley said that for the Board to approve the Use variance the applicant has the burden to present special reasons for the granting of the variance and that it may be granted without detriment to the public good and will not impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance. She stated that this proposed use fulfills one of the goals of the Municipal Land Use Law and that is to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use for development of all lands in the state in a manner that will promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare. The proposed veterinary clinic use can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good. In fact the public welfare safety and health will be promoted by a veterinary clinic in close proximity to major residential neighborhoods in the township.

Studies have suggested that owning a pet can be beneficial to a persons mental and physical health. So if pets can provide these benefits to people it follows that a veterinary clinic that provides preventive, diagnostic and surgical care for our companions is in turn a benefit to the public good and the public welfare. The proposed use will supply a vital service needed by many residences and will provided utilization of a currently under-utilized property. The site is also particularly well suited for the proposed use.

Ms. Fegley continued that in her opinion the veterinary clinic would not have an adverse affect on the agricultural district, master plan or zoning ordinance. Relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good. The former use of the site as a tractor sales/supply and service dealership was a much more intense use then this proposed veterinary clinic. Vehicle noise, noise levels, vehicle use, emissions and customers would have been more intense than the proposed use of a one doctor veterinary clinic. She stated that she believes that this was substantiated by Mr. Wainwright's testimony of the operations that were conducted at that time when that use was on the site. In fact the property owner is located to the west of the subject property and has testified that he doesn't have a problem with this use.

Ms. Fegley stated that Dr. Campbell's testimony was that patients would be seen on an appointment only basis and all operations would be kept within the facility. Mitigation factors are that the facility will see only dogs and cats and again all of the operations of the facility except for the parking lot are inside. There will be no boarding or kenneling of animals, with the exception of the occasional overnight stay for animals that are not in health to leave the facility. There will be no noise from owners except the owner's cars entering and leaving the facility. Lighting will be as approved during the site plan review and approval. There will be no noxious odors and solid and medical waste will be

handled in the compliance with the standards regulating such use as testified by Dr. Campbell.

Ms. Fegley stated that the proposed use would not injure or detract from the use of the neighboring properties. No outdoor improvements are proposed other than lighting and striping of the parking lot. The existing sign will be replaced with one that identifies the veterinary clinic. With no other exterior improvements the proposed use will not detract from the character of the neighborhood. Adjacent properties will be safeguarded in that all activities of the clinic will be indoors or behind the fencing. The existing building is particularly suited to the proposed use and is easily converted to a clinic facility. The large size of the building allows for a veterinary clinic designed to protect the animals, staff, clients and local residents at all times. The building contains the space necessary to provide a safe workflow and patient separation and minimizing opportunities for animal conflicts. The building also contains enough room to ensure that all the entrances and exits are doubly protected against animal escapes.

Ms. Fegley stated that a permitted use such as a residence would require much more retrofit than the proposed use and would likely not be feasible just because of the design. The exterior of the site is particularly suited in that the front is paved to permit adequate parking area and there are entrances and exits to the facility that will only require striping. Dr. Campbell stated that there are currently 16 parking spaces, but 11 additional parking spaces could be provided along the front of the building, including a handicap space. The parking requirement for the proposed use is 12 spaces.

Ms. Fegley stated that the site is easily accessible from the New Jersey Turnpike, Route 295, Route 130 and Route 206 but is located off of major highways and high traffic areas so any escaped animals would be less likely to be lost, hurt or killed. This also protects clients from danger when transporting their companions into the facility.

She stated that the proposed use would serve the economic interest of the town by keeping a commercial ratable. In reviewing the Florence Township Master Plan it was noted that there were numerous sections that mentioned the loss of ratables and the increase in residences in a disproportionate number to commerce. This use, which is a low intensity commercial use, is compatible and complimentary to the residences and farms and will prevent the loss of the ratable to the township. The Master Plan also addresses major considerations relating to the agricultural area and a concern to protect and preserve farming. This proposed use in the agricultural district does not take agricultural lands out of use. The site was previously developed for commercial sale and service use and is now proposed for a less intensive use while keeping the ratable of a non-residential use.

Ms. Fegley testified that the proposed use would not adversely affect public facilities such as water sewer and fire protection. The existing site is on well and septic and will remain well and septic. Police and fire protection will be no greater than the prior use; in fact it may be less. There will be no outdoor storage of goods or material. There will be no gasoline or other fuels stored on site. The proposal will not adversely affect the safe

flow of traffic or cause congestion. The parking requirement for the veterinary use would be 6 spaces per doctor or exam room which ever is larger, so for this site it would be 12. The site can easily accommodate the required parking in front and behind the building and since the clinic will operate on an appointment only basis there would be no more than four clients at a time. This is potentially substantially less than the prior use, which did not operate on an appointment only basis.

Ms. Fegley stated that the use promotes the general health and welfare of residents by providing health care and surgery facilities for the dog and cat members of their families. The site has adequate parking for the use and is in fact a much less intense use than the prior use. Site lighting will be as per the site plan to be prepared after the use is granted and as per township standards and would be approved by the engineer and the planner. Noise levels will be minimal compared to the prior use.

Ms. Fegley stated that Engineer Guzzi's letter dated April 12, 2011 listed a lot of bulk variances that are required. The site does not comply with a number of standards including minimum lot size, lot depth, maximum lot coverage or minimum rear yard. She said that these are all existing non-conforming conditions and the proposed use does not anticipate increasing any non-conformities. The only proposed changes to the outside of the site will be parking lot striping and lighting. The balance of Engineer Guzzi's letter dealt with the D1 variance, which has already been addressed.

Ms. Fegley stated that Planner Perry's letter dated April 20, 2011 mentioned a number of general comments that pertained to site plan issues and it is the applicant's intent to address these items at time of site plan review.

Ms. Fegley stated that she believes that she has demonstrated that the proposed veterinary clinic in the form proposed is a compatible neighbor in the agricultural district. The proposed use is less intense in terms of noise, vehicle use, customers and emissions than the prior use. The use is consistent with the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance in that it maintains commercial ratables and will benefit the public good and welfare in providing companion care for residents in the vicinity. The use can be granted without substantial impairment to the public good, the zone plan or the Master Plan.

Chairman Fratinardo asked about the new sign that will be proposed. Ms. Fegley stated that they would conform to the ordinance for the sign.

Attorney Sitzler asked if the Board had concerns that Dr. Campbell should become so successful that she needs an additional doctor? Solicitor Frank stated that if Dr. Campbell thinks she might need an additional doctor for the practice she might want to request it at this time. Dr. Campbell stated that the maximum that the building could support a maximum of two doctors and she amended her application to request two doctors if required.

Motion of Taylor, seconded to Bott to open the hearing to public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present. Seeing no one wishing to testify motion was made by Zekas, seconded by Crowell to close the public comment.

Engineer Guzzi stated that all of the comments from his April 12th letter have been addressed.

Planner Perry stated that Ms. Fegley has addressed all of the items listed in his letter dated April 19th and she has met the criteria that is outlined under New Jersey Land Use Law for the grant of a Use Variance.

Solicitor Frank stated that this application is for a Use Variance under D1 of the statute which would essentially replace the existing Use Variance on the property which permitted there to be lawn/garden equipment sales with a veterinary clinic use. The proposed conditions for the approval would be that there would be no general boarding or kenneling of animals, patients would typically not stay overnight, there would be a maximum of two doctors, two technicians, a part time administrator, and a receptionist, there would be soundproofing between the interior walls, all disposal of medical wastes would be off site by a service contractor, there would be no outside storage or display and the approval would be subject to site plan review.

Motion of Zekas, seconded by Bott to grant the applicant's request for Use Variance subject to the conditions outlined by Solicitor Frank.

Upon roll call the Board voted s follows:

YEAS: Crowell, Fratinardo, Groze, Taylor, Zekas, Adams, Bott
 NOES: None
 ABSENT: Buddenbaum, Montgomery

MINUTES

Motion of Zekas, seconded by Adams to approve the Minutes from the regular meeting of March 22, 2011 as submitted. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

There being no further business motion was made by Groze, seconded by Taylor to adjourn the meeting at 10:47 p.m.

Ray Montgomery, Secretary

RM/ne